

MEETING #12 February 19

At a Joint Workshop Session of the Madison County Board of Supervisors and the Madison County Planning Commission on February 19, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. in the Administrative Center Auditorium located at 414 N. Main Street:

PRESENT: Doris G. Lackey, Chair
R. Clay Jackson, Vice-Chair
Jonathon Weakley, Member
Robert W. Campbell, Member
R. Clay Jackson, Member
Kevin McGhee, Member
V. R. Shackelford, III, County Attorney
Ernest C. Hoch, County Administrator
Leo Tayamen, Finance Director

ABSENT: Leo Tayamen, Finance Director
Jacqueline S. Frye, Deputy Clerk

Agenda:

1. Call to Order/Determine Presence of a Quorum

2. Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence

The Board of Supervisors commenced their meeting with the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence.

3. Adoption of Agenda

Chairman Lackey called for adoption of today's Agenda.

Supervisor Jackson moved to adopt today's Agenda, seconded by Supervisor McGhee, with the following vote recorded:

Doris G. Lackey	Aye
R. Clay Jackson	Aye
Jonathon Weakley	Aye
Robert Campbell	Aye
Kevin McGhee	Aye

4. Discussion:

Carlton Yowell, Commission Chair, opened tonight's meeting and advised the purpose of tonight's workshop session is to discuss the composition of the Madison County Planning Commission's membership and the duties of the Commission.

Chairman Lackey advised the Madison County Board of Supervisors has not come to a decision about the Madison County Planning Commission, as there are some Board members who'd like to see the Commission size be reduced and some who'd like to see the size reduced. The Board would like to discuss this issue to attain input on the role of the Commission and to also provide the Commission with the opportunity to do more than what's currently being done.

Comments from the Commission members were as follows:

Carlton Yowell: Suggested the Commission remain at its current size of twelve (12); feels this size will bring forth greater involvement and increased opinions; although the existing group is a 'young team', he feels as time progresses, there will be more experience in place.

Phillip Brockman: Concurred with Mr. Yowell; feels that by reducing the size, the current bylaws will need to be changed to indicate any size reduction; also feels a member may be a Supervisor, and all members must be citizens of Madison County.

David Jones: Advised the Commission is a 'creature' of the Commonwealth, but is appointed by the Madison County Board of Supervisors.

Chairman Lackey advised the current bylaws can be changed by a majority vote of the Commission; most commissions in the State consist of seven (7) to nine (9) members; a reduction in size could result by the Board electing not to fill any future vacated positions. She feels that a smaller Commission would be more efficient, manageable, and able to do more things.

Mary Breeden: Questioned why the Board would like the size reduced and why is it felt that a smaller group would be more efficient.

Supervision Jackson: Advised he'd like to hear from the Commission; thus far, he perceives the Commission members want the size to remain at twelve (12), and have a Supervisor appointed; he advised the semantics of how to proceed with changing the bylaws is biased based on the Commission's opinion.

David Jones: In regards to efficiency, he feels if the Board wants a Commission made up of members who are willing to work on sub-committees and not receive any credit, there are barely enough folks available to accomplish this task; the existing group is the closest group Madison County has had (i.e. diverse) and possesses a strong desire to represent what the County is all about. In closing, he's satisfied with the fact that Madison's Commission isn't the 'standard' (as noted in the State).

Danny Crigler: Feels the Commission should remain at its existing size; a Supervisor can be appointed; members must participate and represent the County; the existing Commission doesn't always agree, but a great deal of input is provided at each workshop; the Commission currently has four (4) working sub-committees and

there are four (4) representatives on each sub-committee; some members serve on more than one sub-committee; most meetings take place once a month; if the membership is decreased, those appointed will be taxed to get the work done in the amount of time involved with fewer representatives to provide input; feels it will be difficult to 'hire' folks to serve based on the stipend provided.

Phillip Brockman: Feels the efficiency in reducing the size will be a smaller amount (i.e. stipend) paid, which he doesn't feel will be very effective; he also advised the work involved in writing ordinances, etc. does take time; the larger the group, the better, as there are folks in place who are able to dedicate their time to getting the tasks accomplished.

Carlton Yowell: Doesn't feel an expanded role doesn't equal cutting numbers; there are three (3) items on tonight's workshop that will involve assigning three (3) members to each item.

Mary Breeden: Would like to see the Commission remain at twelve (12) and one member should be a Supervisor who will know how the Commission stands; she feels the existing size has worked well and represents diversity from the County.

Albert Tartaglia: Questioned if the size of twelve (12) members is a historical issue or whether the size is due to another reason; he questioned if a Supervisor is on the Board, would that person be allowed to vote twice, and how would the public perceive this type of action; he advised the Commission members have worked on many sub-committees and he wants to be involved and it isn't for the stipend that's received.

Fay Utz: Looks at serving as a form of 'volunteering; was surprised to learn what the Commission is supposed to be doing in addition to working on cases presented; looking ahead to discover ways to promote jobs here; feels the number of members is irrelevant; wishes the seating could be arranged in a circular fashion to promote eye contact; has no issue with a Supervisor serving on the Commission, but doesn't this factor is absolutely necessary at this time.

Nan Coppedge: Feel nine (9) members on the Commission would be fine; current group consists of a diverse group of citizens; feels the cross section of members is good and uncompromising; if the bylaws can be amended to denote a 'minimum of nine members' she suggested this be done for one year – the membership can always be increased if the change doesn't work well; lowering the membership will impose a slight decrease to the budget; she feels a Supervisor should serve as a liaison and can provide insight the Commission members may not be aware of. In some localities, the Supervisor is allowed to vote and in some, no vote is allowed. In closing, she advised the Board and the Commission discussed the issue of reducing the Commission in the past.

The County Attorney read the State Code indicates as to how the planning commission was created.

§ 15.2-2210. Creation of local planning commissions; participation in planning district commissions or joint local commissions.

Every locality shall by resolution or ordinance create a local planning commission in order to promote the orderly development of the locality and its environs. In accomplishing the objectives of § 15.2-2200 the local planning commissions shall serve primarily in an advisory capacity to the governing bodies.

Any locality may participate in a planning district commission in accordance with Chapter 42 (§ 15.2-4200 et seq.) of this title or a joint local commission in accordance with § 15.2-2219.

(1975, c. 641, § 15.1-427.1; 1997, c. 587.)

Additionally, he advised the planning commission is created by the Madison County Board of Supervisors, either by resolution or an ordinance (i.e. feels a resolution was enacted in the past). Also, the Virginia State Code provided that a mechanism be in place for staggered terms – members were to serve a term of one (1) year, two (2) years, three (3) years and four (4) years. He believes the scheme for arriving at twelve (12) members was that there would be four (4) classes of three (3) members each (i.e. one year term, two year term, three year term and four year term). The provision in the State Code calls for a rotating membership. In addition to the number, a decision will be needed concerning the fact the rotation has gotten out of sync in Madison County. He also feels it's good for a governing body to have an overlap of experience in place and suggested the appointment times be consistent each year (i.e. January 31st) which will coincide with the beginning term of the Supervisors. He also advised the history of a Supervisor being on the Commission has always been the case since he has been the County Attorney (1976), as having a Board member in place does serve the County well.

The Madison County Board of Supervisors provided the following points:

Supervisor Campbell: Feels the Virginia Code allows the Madison County Board of Supervisor to create a planning commission; a Board member can attend any meeting as a liaison and not vote; feels there's enough County funding to add a couple of additional seats as a practical matter, in order to facilitate the members in place; Commission members are closest to the citizens because of dealing with property requests here; doesn't feel there's a management problem and suggested the Board not be involved with the management of the Commission.

Supervisor Jackson: Doesn't have mixed feelings either way and plans to attend the Commission meetings in order to stay abreast of the cases being presented before action is taken; likes the idea of citizen involvement and representation on the

Commission; feels the Commission should determine the size of its membership; doesn't recall a Supervisor ever voting while serving as a liaison; agrees the Commission is very reactive and suggested the Supervisors come up with some greater tasks for the Commission; thanked the County Attorney for the information he provided on the history/concept of the Commission.

Supervisor Weakley: Questioned the number of Commission members at one point and is looking for input; was receptive to the objectives the Commission has undertaken and has in place at this time; asked if there was anyway the Board could be more supportive; feels that having an active, working body is the main goal, no matter what the membership size is.

Chairman Lackey: Feels the Commission is made up of a terrific group of members; advised the County's Commission is one of the largest in the State for one of the State's smallest localities; also feels there's a good reason as to why most Commissions are smaller (seven [7] to nine [9] members), as there was a time when all members (in the past) weren't dedicated to performing the work that was needed; also questioned the efficiency of having folks able to look directly at one another during deliberations is an important factor; also feels there should be a Supervisor in place to overlook deliberations, but not be allowed to vote.

Additional comments were made pertaining to the fact the Commission's bylaws could be changed to indicate a smaller membership, and could be accomplished by not filling any proposed vacancies.

Supervisor McGhee: Feels tonight's meeting is done in a 'reverse order' as he'd like to first discuss what the Commission would like to do; suggested tonight's proposal be given more thought and then organize the means to carry out any future changes; he's more interested in what can be produced by the Commission rather than the number of members; felt the Commission did put in a lot of time on specific projects (Route 29 Corridor Study, Comprehensive Plan), and doesn't feel the Commission ever felt limited with the amount of members; feels having nine (9) members is ok, but there are times when more members are needed to address specific projects; doesn't want to see the Commission become frustrated; the Board could be offering projects to the Commission that would present a greater challenge.

Mr. Brockman advised the Commission is the group to make recommendations to the Board based on citizen's concerns regarding specific plans for the County.

Mr. Crigler advised that he worked on the committee that addressed the Route 29 Corridor Study and the Comprehensive plan; there were citizens that attended the sub-committee meetings to provide input; he feels there is a greater amount of input when there are more members on the Commission.

Supervisor Campbell verbalized concerns with the Board trying to get involved with the Commission's affairs.

Ms. Utz advised that most individuals desire to be a part of the Commission to help make things better for the County; she also suggested the 'politics' be removed and that the Commission be allowed to work for the betterment of Madison County as necessary.

Mr. Yowell questioned the 'expanded role' of the Commission, as indicated by the Board.

Chairman Lackey advised the Board's purpose tonight is to hear from the Commission members.

Mr. Jones advised the Commission is an extension of the Board and is in place to do what's best for Madison County from a planning perspective and not playing 'politics'; the job of the Commission is to provide the Board with the best call for the County overall; whether a suggestion is expedited or not is a decision of the Board. In closing, he advised the Commission is willing to look at any projects the County unanimously votes to be researched; he also questioned if there will be additional items the Commission will need to address in the coming year.

Ms. Breeden advised there was a meeting in the past where the Commission worked on thirty-two (32) cases in one night; there have always been several citizens to provide input on the comprehensive plan.

Supervisor Campbell advised he doesn't feel the Board should schedule any projects for the Commission to oversee.

Chairman Lackey feels one of the most important things in the County is the Route 29 Corridor Study and how this issue will relate to the County; she feels the County needs assistance from the Commission regarding the most reasonable and appropriate measure to take on the aforementioned issue, as there will be repercussions for many years to come.

Ms. Breeden advised that economic development on Route 29 is very important, and feels the County isn't utilizing the economic development of what's already in place here.

Supervisor McGhee advised the Route 29 Corridor Study required a lot of time and effort and was a recommendation contained in the comprehensive plan; he questioned if there are other items noted in the comprehensive plan that the Commission feels needs to be addressed pertaining to planning.

Mr. Tartaglia advised there will always be environmental issues, but he feels this locality needs public involvement; if the public doesn't attend the meetings, things can't be done here, as there must be citizen involvement before any planning can be investigated.

Ms. Breeden advised that some public comment needs to be heeded.

On behalf of the Board, Chairman Lackey thanked the members of the Madison County Planning Commission for tonight's discussion; she hopes these types of meeting can continue in the future on a quarterly basis so as to identify issues that need to be addressed.

Commission members verbalized hopes the Board will appreciate the Commission's decision on keeping the existing number of members as is, and to move forward with filling the vacant positions in place.

In closing, it was advised the Commission would discuss tonight's concerns further and a vote will probably be taken at the March Joint Meeting. Also, if the Commission votes to lower the number of members, a vote will be taken to change the bylaws in order to accomplish any changes.

After discussion, the County Attorney clarified the protocol involved pertaining to tonight's discussion (i.e. lowering the number of Commission members).

Ms. Breeden asked that the Board respect the opinions of those who serve on the Madison County Planning Commission, as she feels this is very important for the continuity and cooperation between both entities.

Comments were made in reference to the Route 29 Corridor; a response has been received from VDOT – this issue will be assigned to one of the sub-committees this evening for further assessment/review, and provide a recommendation to the Board.

5. Information/Correspondence (if any)

6. Adjournment

With no further action being required by the Board, Chairman Lackey adjourned the meeting, with the following vote recorded:

Doris G. Lackey	Aye
R. Clay Jackson	Aye
Jonathon Weakley	Aye
Robert Campbell	Aye
Kevin McGhee	Aye

Doris G. Lackey, Chairman
Madison County Board of Supervisors

Clerk of the Board of Madison County Board Supervisors

Adopted on: April 8, 2014

Copies: Doris G. Lackey, R. Clay Jackson, Jonathon Weakley, Robert Campbell,
Kevin McGhee, V. R. Shackelford, III & Constitutional Officers



Agenda
Madison County Board of Supervisors
Madison County Planning Commission
Joint Workshop Session Agenda
Wednesday, February 19, 2014 at 5:30 p.m.
414 N. Main Street, Madison, Virginia



Agenda

1. Call to Order/Determine Presence of a Quorum
- 2. *Pledge of Allegiance & Moment of Silence***
3. Adoption of Agenda
4. Discussion:
5. Information/Correspondence (if any)
6. Adjournment